



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,811

05/25/2006

Yousef Wasef Nijim

PU030336

6449

24498 7590 12/01/2009
Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

LEE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ioka (6,558,006).

Regarding claim 1, Ioka discloses an image projection display apparatus showing at least first and second projectors (3a-3d), and an image processor (2) for adjusting the first and second image portions according to a quadratic relationship (col. 10, line 58, to col. 11, line 8).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, see col. 5, line 64, to col. 6, line 3.

Regarding claim 7, loka states that the gamma corrections for image A and image B are different from each other (col. 9, lines 39-42). This also means the gamma correction in the overlapping area is different from the non-overlapping areas because it is a result of two gamma corrections, A and B.

Regarding claim 8, see summary of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over loka (6,558,006) in view of Dorbie (6,545,685).

Regarding claim 6, loka does not disclose that the processor adjusts the brightness without relying on information provided by any screen image capture means. Instead, loka utilizes a camera 5. However, Dorbie, from the similar field of endeavor,

Art Unit: 2622

teaches that the overlapping area of two projected images can be blended together without the need of feedback from a camera. By doing so, the blending apparatus can be made simple and low in cost. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Ioka to include the cameraless blending feature of Dorbie so that the overall system could be kept simple and low in cost.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 14-18 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/8/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that Ioka does not disclose that the image processor which is coupled to first and second projectors "adjusts said brightness of said first and said second image portions according to a quadratic relationship", the Examiner disagrees. As shown in Figure 2, the brightness of the projected images including the overlapping areas is adjusted by the shading compensator, the bias compensator 25, or the gamma compensator 26. Since all these compensators are connected after the geometric compensator 22, which carries out the quadratic

Art Unit: 2622

deformation, the brightness adjustments carries out by the respective compensators are nonetheless following the transformed quadratic relationship. For instance, since the input of the shading compensator 24 is coupled to the output of the geometric compensator 22, the former must follow the quadratic transformed image provided by the latter. The same applies for the other two compensators. Clearly, Ioka still meets the claimed invention. As a result, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran, can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622